

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE DOE,
Plaintiff,
v.
DANIEL PETERSON, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [22-cv-03178-VC](#)


**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
REMAND**

Re: Dkt. No. 10

The motion to remand is denied. Counsel for the defendants clearly could have done a better job determining whether Simmaron was served, but Simmaron now joins in the removal, and the Court declines to penalize the defendants for the failings of their counsel on this issue.¹ *See, e.g., Destfino v. Reiswig*, 630 F.3d 952, 956–57 (9th Cir. 2011), and *Leal v. County of San Bernardino*, No. EDCV191736JFWSHKX, 2019 WL 5784177, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2019).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 23, 2022



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge

¹ Doe attempts to make new arguments for remand in her reply, but those arguments have been forfeited and are meritless in any event.